

Dear Quin,

1/14/84

There is something I've intended writing you about and intended to ask you about when we spoke several weeks ago but I then forgot and earlier I'd not gotten around to it. It has to do with something you asked me long ago, before my surgeries, the first of which was in 9/80, when we were both seeking a way of winding up the JFK field office cases.

You asked me what one thing I regarded as most important or significant of the remaining issues and I responded all the FBI's records on or about the critics. You then incorporated this in the letter you wrote for Schenefield's signature, using language that the FBI, I believe deliberately, misinterpreted. So, it remained an issue because it engaged in a phony search.

I cannot and do not pretend to detailed recall but I am confident about what you had in mind from two things: our discussions of this and something you once told me -- that the FBI does not file by subject.

The FBI's interpretation of the letter is that it was to search under the word "critics," which it claims to have done and thus found nothing at all. It is conspicuous that they never asked you for an affidavit establishing your intention and that they did not make any effort to refute my attestations.

I am certain that because you knew that the FBI does not file by subject you would not have drafted a letter requiring them to engage in a knowingly meaningless search. I am also certain that as I spotted then I provided correct field office file numbers with my appeals. There is no doubt that they did not search any of the correct numbers I provided from disclosed records, both Dallas and New Orleans. I did not receive any record from any of them.

I would like a letter if you have sufficient recollection of this matter. I think that if you recall that you knew (and also told me) that the FBI did not file by subject that should be enough. If you recall any more, and I'm not certain that you told me that you had discussed this with the FBI, that, of course, would be welcome indeed.

I've been trying to be of some help to Theoharis and I've finished his book, "Beyond the Hiss Case." I think it is excellent. He has several new projects in mind. I suggested that he consult your recollection, so if it leads you to some extra work, mea culpa. I think they are worthwhile projects.

For what has happened to us in the past eight days we are making out well. Idl fell in the kitchen a week ago yesterday and broke a metatarsal bone in her right foot. She is getting around well with a walker, in a soft cast. To paraphrase what the orthopedist said, if she had to break a bone, she picked the best. It will heal in a month and ~~she~~ can be walked on from the outset with a cast. She is now taking a few steps without using the walker --but holding it in case. I was taken to the hospital in an ambulance in Tuesday's snow storm with a bleeding ulcer suspected. Indications that are not fully persuasive to the family doctor is that the ulcer was not bleeding. More tests next week.

Hyacinth-grower PS:

Best wishes,

Idl had a row 15-18 feet long. This past year only one came up. Investigation disclosed that the chipmunks dined on them. I got some traps from the State and caught squirrels and rabbits but only 2 chipmunks. So I bought a smaller one they can trip. I took the animals I trapped to where they would not be a nuisance. My own fault. As I cleared the land I made brushpiles for them to live and hide in. Now that you know what they like, beware! The humane trap is Havaheart brand.